UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES	OF AMERICA, PETITIONER,)	
V.)	5:08-HC-2108-BO
PAUL ALDRICH,	RESPONDENT.)))	
)	

STATUS CONFERENCE
OCTOBER 27, 2010
BEFORE THE HONORABLE TERRENCE W. BOYLE
U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PETITIONER:

MR. R.A. RENFER, JR. ASST. U.S. ATTORNEY 310 NEW BERN AVE. RALEIGH, NC

FOR THE RESPONDENT:

MS. SUZANNE LITTLE
MS. JANE PEARCE
FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER
RALEIGH, NC

MR. MARK SIGMON ATTORNEY AT LAW 4350 LASSITER AT NORTH HILLS, SUITE 375 RALEIGH, NC

COURT REPORTER: DONNA J. TOMAWSKI STENOTYPE WITH COMPUTER AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

1	OCTOBER 27, 2010
2	THE COURT: YOU ARE MR. SIGMON?
3	MR. SIGMON: YES, SIR.
4	THE COURT: YOU FILED THE 2241 BRIEF?
5	MR. SIGMON: CORRECT.
6	THE COURT: THANK YOU. MR. SIGMON, YOUR BRIEF
7	ARGUES THE POINT THAT WE HEARD IN THE LAST CASE, THAT THE
8	EXISTENCE OF PROCEDURES UNDER 4248 IS NOT TO INTERFERE
9	WITH THE AVAILABILITY OF HABEAS UNDER 2241.
10	MR. SIGMON: YES, YOUR HONOR.
11	THE COURT: AND THAT'S FOUNDATIONAL, ISN'T IT?
12	I MEAN, THE SUPREME COURT HAS SAID THAT LONG AGO. IT
13	DOESN'T REQUIRE YOU TO FORGO HABEAS IF YOU ARE BEING
14	ILLEGALLY DETAINED.
15	MR. SIGMON: THAT'S CORRECT, YOUR HONOR. AND IN
16	ADDITION, I THINK AS YOUR HONOR POINTED OUT, I DON'T SEE
17	HOW AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL SCHEME ITSELF COULD BE AN
18	ALTERNATIVE.
19	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.
20	MS. LITTLE, YOU AND MS. PEARCE ARE HERE?
21	MS. LITTLE: THAT'S CORRECT.
22	THE COURT: YOUR CLIENT, IS HE BEING HOUSED IN
23	MARYLAND?
24	MS. LITTLE: HE IS HOUSED IN THE MARYLAND UNIT,
25	YOUR HONOR. HE WAS TRANSFERRED TO BUTNER APPROXIMATELY

THE SUMMER OF 2007. HE WAS IN GENERAL POPULATION UNTIL 1 2 ABOUT OCTOBER OF 2008 AND THEN HE WAS MOVED INTO THE 3 MARYLAND UNIT IN OCTOBER OF 2008. THE CERTIFICATION WAS 4 FILED ON JULY 24, 2008. 5 THE COURT: WHAT WAS HIS RELEASE DATE? MS. LITTLE: HIS RELEASE DATE WAS OCTOBER 13, 6 7 2008. HE WAS DETAINED -- HE WAS IN CUSTODY BECAUSE HE HAD BEEN CONVICTED OF A 922(G)(1) IN THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF 8 9 NEW YORK BACK IN 2006. HE GOT A 30-MONTH SENTENCE WITH 10 THREE YEARS OF SUPERVISED RELEASE. 11 THE COURT: SO WHEN HE WAS CERTIFIED, DID THEY MOVE HIM OR DID THEY LEAVE HIM IN THE SAME POPULATION, 12 13 THEY JUST USED IT AS A LATER ADJUDICATION? 14 MS. LITTLE: CORRECT. HE WAS CERTIFIED. THE CERTIFICATION WAS ACTUALLY DATED IN MAY OF '08. IT WAS 15 FILED IN COURT ON JULY 24, '08, AND THEN HE WAS MOVED FROM 16 17 GENERAL POPULATION TO THE MARYLAND UNIT IN OCTOBER OF 2008. 18 19 THE COURT: AT THE EXACT POINT OF HIS SENTENCE 20 EXPIRING? 21 MS. LITTLE: APPROXIMATELY, UH-HUH. THE COURT: AND SO HE'S BEEN, SINCE OCTOBER OF 22 23 '08, IN 4248 DETENTION? 24 MS. LITTLE: THAT'S CORRECT.

THE COURT: TWO YEARS APPROXIMATELY?

1	MS. LITTLE: CORRECT.
2	THE COURT: AND YOU HAVE HIS CERTIFICATION?
3	MS. LITTLE: YES, YOUR HONOR. WE HAVE A COPY OF
4	IT.
5	THE COURT: AND THE BASIS, THE FACTUAL BASIS FOR
6	IT APPEARS ALL IN PARAGRAPH THREE, SUB PARAGRAPHS A, B AND
7	C?
8	MS. LITTLE: RIGHT. THERE'S THREE GROUNDS FOR
9	THE CERTIFICATION. FIRST WAS THE PRIOR CONVICTION IN NEW
10	YORK BACK IN 1989 FOR A SEX OFFENSE. THERE WAS A LIMITED
11	PSYCHOLOGICAL REVIEW AS WELL AS RESULTS OF THE TESTS, THE
12	STATIC99 AND THE RRASOR. WHEN I SPOKE WITH MY CLIENT, HE
13	DOES NOT RECALL GOING THROUGH ANY TESTING.
14	THE COURT: THIS ALL HAPPENED WHILE HE WAS IN
15	THE BOP SERVING HIS ACTIVE SENTENCE?
16	MS. LITTLE: WE PRESUME THAT'S WHAT HAPPENED,
17	THAT'S CORRECT.
18	THE COURT: BECAUSE THE CERTIFICATE COMES,
19	DOESN'T IT, IT COMES IN MAY OF '08, SO IT COMES WHILE HE'S
20	SERVING HIS ACTIVE SENTENCE?
21	MS. LITTLE: THAT'S CORRECT.
22	THE COURT: COULDN'T BE LATER IN TIME.
23	MS. LITTLE: IT WAS DEFINITELY, BECAUSE HIS
24	ACTIVE SENTENCE WAS DUE TO EXPIRE OCTOBER 13, SO IT WAS
25	WRITTEN WHILE HE WAS SERVING HIS ACTIVE SENTENCE AND FILED

BEFORE HIS ACTIVE SENTENCE HAD BEEN COMPLETED AS WELL. 1 THE COURT: WAS HE GIVEN ANY PROCEEDINGS TO 2 3 CHALLENGE THIS OR TO HAVE ANY INPUT INTO IT? 4 MS. LITTLE: NOT THAT I'M AWARE OF, NO. HE WAS ASKED IF HE WOULD LIKE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PSYCHOLOGICAL 5 EVALUATION AND HE DID NOT WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THAT. 6 7 THE COURT: OTHER THAN THE CONDUCT IN 1989 FOR WHICH HE WAS SENTENCED, IS THERE ANY OTHER ADJUDICATED 8 9 CONDUCT OF A SEXUAL NATURE? 10 MS. LITTLE: I AM NOT AWARE OF ANY OTHER CONDUCT 11 THAT WAS A PART -- CONSIDERED AS PART OF THIS 12 CERTIFICATION. ALL I REALLY GOT IS WHAT THEY HAVE, THE 13 BASIS, THE CERTIFICATION THAT THEY STATE IN THEIR 14 PAPERWORK. SO I CAN'T PRESUME THAT THEY HAVE LOOKED AT 15 ANYTHING ELSE. THE COURT: OKAY. HE HAS A THREE-YEAR TERM OF 16 17 SUPERVISED RELEASE? 18 MS. LITTLE: THAT'S CORRECT, YOUR HONOR. 19 THE COURT: EVEN IF IT WERE TO BEGIN AT THE 20 COMPLETION OF HIS SENTENCE, HE STILL HAS AT LEAST A YEAR, 21 ALMOST, OF THAT? MS. LITTLE: YEAH. 22 23 THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU. 24 NO ONE REALLY KNOWS, IN THE COURSE OF THIS LITIGATION 25 THAT'S BEEN GOING ON NOW FOR SEVERAL YEARS, IF THE LAW IS

THAT ASSUMING A PERSON IS NO LONGER CERTIFIED AND THE 1 2 CERTIFICATION TERMINATES FOR SOME REASON, EITHER 3 VOLUNTARILY OR OTHERWISE, THERE'S NO CASE LAW THAT WOULD 4 EXPLAIN WHAT HAPPENS TO THE SUPERVISED RELEASE, IS THERE? 5 MR. RENFER: YOU ARE ASKING ME, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YEAH. 6 MR. RENFER: THERE IS NO CASE LAW. 7 THE COURT: I MEAN, ONE COULD ARGUE IT WAS 8 9 RUNNING BECAUSE YOU WERE IN A CUSTODIAL SETTING THAT WAS 10 AT LEAST AS RESTRICTIVE AS SUPERVISED RELEASE, SO EQUITY 11 WOULD CAUSE IT TO RUN OR ANOTHER ONE COULD ARGUE THERE'S 12 NO EQUITY IN CRIMINAL LAW AND SO IT'S THERE AND YOU HAVE 13 TO DO IT OR YOU COULD ARGUE THAT IF IT HADN'T YET EXPIRED 14 IT ATE INTO IT BUT IT DIDN'T END IT. 15 MR. RENFER: ALL OF THESE ARE ARGUMENTS, YOUR 16 HONOR, YES. 17 THE COURT: BUT SOMEBODY WILL HAVE TO KNOW AT 18 SOME POINT. 19 MR. RENFER: THAT IS CORRECT. I EXPECT THE 20 COURT AND ULTIMATELY THE APPELLATE COURTS, IF NOT THE 21 SUPREME COURT, WILL DECIDE THAT ISSUE. THE COURT: CERTAINLY THE APPELLATE COURTS. 22 23 MR. RENFER: CERTAINLY, YES, SIR. 24 THE COURT: BECAUSE THE DAY IS GOING TO COME,

IRRESPECTIVE OF WHAT WE'RE DOING HERE TODAY, WHEN SOMEONE

OR MORE THAN SOMEONE WILL NO LONGER BE A DETAINEE, EITHER 1 2 BECAUSE THEY HAVE BEEN RECOVERED UNDER THE PROCESS OR THEY 3 HAVE HAD A TRIAL AND IT FOUND THAT THEY'RE NOT SUBJECT, OR 4 WHATEVER THE REASON IS, AND THEN THE SUPERVISED RELEASE ISSUE IS GOING TO IMMEDIATELY BECOME CURRENT. 5 MR. RENFER: I EXPECT THAT'S RIGHT, YES, SIR. 6 7 THE COURT: BUT WE DON'T HAVE ANY GUIDANCE ON THAT RIGHT NOW? 8 9 MR. RENFER: NO, WE DO NOT. 10 THE COURT: OKAY. 11 MR. RENFER: OBVIOUSLY, WE'VE LOOKED AT IT, YOUR 12 HONOR, BUT AS FAR AS GUIDANCE IN THAT SENSE, NO. 13 THE COURT: BECAUSE YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE A 14 MIXED BAG. YOU WILL HAVE PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN THERE FOUR YEARS AND HAD A THREE-YEAR TERMS OF SUPERVISED RELEASE AND 15 16 PEOPLE THAT HAVE BEEN THERE ONE YEAR AND HAD FIVE-YEAR TERMS OF SUPERVISED RELEASE. OR THE MORE RECENT IN TIME 17 CONVICTIONS OR SOME OF THE CONVICTIONS MAY HAVE LIFE 18 19 SUPERVISED RELEASE. SO IT'S NOT GOING TO MATTER. 20 MR. RENFER: YOUR HONOR, IT'S NOT OUR 21 GUIDANCE -- IT'S NOT GUIDANCE TO US AS SUCH, BUT I BELIEVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS HAS ISSUED AN 22 23 OPINION ON THAT THAT THE COURT MIGHT REVIEW. 24 THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.

25

MR. RENFER: THE COURT MIGHT BE AWARE OF THAT

1 ALREADY.

THE COURT: NO, I'M NOT.

AND MUST BE LITIGATED.

MR. RENFER: YOU MIGHT LOOK AT THAT BECAUSE THAT IS SOME. AS I SAY, IT'S NOT GUIDANCE TO US BUT OBVIOUSLY IT IS SOMETHING THAT WE WILL BE REVIEWING AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME WHEN THIS ISSUE COMES TO THE FOREFRONT

THE COURT: THANK YOU. MS. PEARCE?

MS. PEARCE: JUST BRIEFLY, YOUR HONOR. I HAVE
TO GO BACK IN MEMORY HERE, BUT THERE IS SOME CASE LAW
ADDRESSING THIS AREA. IT'S UNCLEAR BECAUSE THE STATUTE
STATES, SUPERVISED RELEASE CANNOT COMMENCE UNTIL A
DEFENDANT IS RELEASED FROM CUSTODY. AND THEN THE
SUPERVISED RELEASE STATUTE ITSELF, THERE'S AN INDICATION
THAT A DEFENDANT MUST SERVE AT LEAST ONE YEAR BEFORE A
COURT COULD MODIFY, ALTER, OR TERMINATE A TERM OF
SUPERVISION. I BELIEVE THE CASE WAS JOHNSON. I LITIGATED
THIS A NUMBER OF YEARS AGO.

AS RELATES TO THE STATUS OF THESE INDIVIDUALS HELD NOW, IT IS UNCLEAR, AS THE GOVERNMENT ACKNOWLEDGES, BUT THERE IS SOME LAW OUT THERE GIVING US SOMETHING TO WORK WITH.

THE COURT: WELL, I WOULD THINK THE WORD

"CUSTODY" IS A CRIMINAL DEFINITION AND INVOLVES THE

SERVICE OF YOUR SENTENCE, NOT THIS CIVIL DETENTION WHICH

1 IS UNDER THE STATUTE AND THE GOVERNMENT'S INTERPRETATION
2 IS CHARACTERIZED NOT AS CUSTODIAL.

MS. PEARCE: EXACTLY. AS WE DISCUSSED, I

BELIEVE IN OUR LAST SESSION, IS MR. ALDRICH IS A PRETRIAL

DETAINEE ON A CIVIL MATTER. THAT'S HOW WE DESCRIBE HIS

STATUS. SO IT'S A CIVIL MATTER. SO HIS CRIMINAL

CUSTODIAL SENTENCE IS COMPLETE AND I BELIEVE, I HAVE TO GO

BACK AND REVIEW WHAT I LITIGATED A NUMBER OF YEARS AGO,

THAT IT WAS A QUESTION OF WHETHER ONCE ONE WAS COMMITTED

UNDER 4246, WHETHER A CIVIL COMMITMENT TOLLED THE

SUPERVISION PERIOD. THESE INDIVIDUALS ARE IN DIFFERENT

PROCEDURAL POSTURE.

THE COURT: WHAT HAPPENS TO SOMEBODY WHO'S -- I
HAVE SOME CASES, I DID ONE THIS MORNING, A PERSON WHO
ENTERED A PLEA OF GUILTY TO A CRIME AND THEN WAS
DETERMINED NOT TO BE COMPETENT TO GO FURTHER WITH THE
CRIMINAL CASE BECAUSE THEY LOST THEIR CAPACITY, AND SO
THEY HAVEN'T RECEIVED A SENTENCE YET. BUT THEY HAVE BEEN
HELD FOR A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF TIME TRYING TO BE
MEDICATED OR IMPROVED SO THAT THEY CAN THEN RECEIVE A
SENTENCE. IS THAT CREDITABLE TIME OR NOT CREDITABLE TIME?

MS. PEARCE: UNDER 18 U.S.C. SECTION 4244, THAT

DEALS WITH THE COMMITMENT OF AN INDIVIDUAL IN THAT

POSTURE, SO I BELIEVE THAT IS SORT OF A DEFAULT POSITION,

THAT THE TIME THAT INDIVIDUAL IS SERVING IS CREDITED

TOWARDS THE MAXIMUM POSSIBLE SENTENCE HE OR SHE COULD HAVE 1 2 RECEIVED. 3 THE COURT: SO IF THEY ARE HELD FOR 12 MONTHS 4 UNDER THE MENTAL HEALTH COMPONENT BETWEEN THERE PLEA AND 5 THE DATE THAT THEY ARE SENTENCED AND THEY ARE SENTENCED TO 24 MONTHS, THEY WOULD GET 12 MONTHS CREDIT? 6 7 MS. PEARCE: I BELIEVE THAT'S CORRECT, YOUR 8 HONOR. 9 THE COURT: AND SUPPOSE THEY ARE GIVEN NO TERM 10 OF PRISON, WOULD IT GO AGAINST THEIR SUPERVISED RELEASE? 11 MS. PEARCE: THAT I DO NOT KNOW. 12 THE COURT: OKAY. DO YOU WANT TO ADD ANYMORE TO 13 THIS CASE? 14 MS. LITTLE: I JUST WANT TO ADD A LITTLE BIT 15 ABOUT THE FACT THAT A LOT OF OUR CASES, OUR CLIENTS HAVE 16 GONE BACK TO THEIR SENTENCING JUDGE TO CLARIFY THEIR TERM 17 OF SUPERVISED RELEASE, IF IT'S GOING TO EXPIRE WHILE HELD IN CUSTODY OR NOT. IT APPEARS IT'S A MIXED BAG AS TO SOME 18 19 JUDGES. 20 THE COURT: EXPLAIN THAT TO ME. 21 MS. LITTLE: THE CLIENTS HAVE ACTUALLY FILED 22 LETTERS, THEY'VE WRITTEN LETTERS TO THEIR SENTENCING 23 JUDGE. 24 THE COURT: HIS SENTENCING JUDGE IS IN THE

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

MS. LITTLE: RIGHT. AND I DON'T KNOW IF HE'S

WRITTEN TO HIS JUDGE PRECISELY OR WHAT HIS JUDGE HAS

DECIDED, BUT I KNOW IN OTHER CASES SOME OF THE SENTENCING

JUDGES IN THE OTHER DISTRICTS HAVE SAID YES, WE'LL CREDIT

YOU, YOUR SUPERVISED RELEASE BEGAN ON YOUR RELEASE DATE.

THE COURT: THE JUDGE ISN'T GOING TO DO THAT

WITHOUT THE U. S. ATTORNEY. I MEAN, THE JUDGE ISN'T GOING

TO GET -- I'M NOT GOING TO GET A LETTER IN MY OFFICE AND

MAKE A LEGAL RULING ON THAT. I'M GOING TO HAVE IT

PRESENTED BY THE OPPOSING PARTIES.

MS. LITTLE: I AGREE. I'M JUST SAYING WE HAVE

SEEN THIS IN SOME OF OUR CASES. SO THAT'S WHY THERE'S A

MIXED BAG OUT THERE, WHAT'S HAPPENING WITH THE SUPERVISED

RELEASE.

THE COURT: FIRST OF ALL, THE JUDGE DOESN'T HAVE
ANY AUTHORITY TO CHANGE A SENTENCE AFTER THE SENTENCE IS
IMPOSED UNLESS IT'S DONE BY CONSENT. YOU CAN'T SAY I GAVE
YOU TOO MUCH TIME, TAKE A YEAR OFF.

MS. LITTLE: I AGREE WITH YOU. I'M JUST TELLING
YOU WHAT'S HAPPENED IN SOME OF THE CASES. WE DON'T KNOW
IF IT WAS ACTUALLY PRESENTED TO THE JUDGE IN OPEN COURT,
IF THERE WERE BRIEFS ON IT, WE JUST DON'T KNOW, BUT THERE
IS SOME OF THAT OUT THERE.

SO SOME OF OUR CLIENTS ARE SAYING THAT THEIR TERM OF SUPERVISED RELEASE HAS BEEN COMPLETED OR IS PARTIALLY

COMPLETED, OR WHATEVER. IN THIS CASE, IT HAS NOT BEEN 1 2 BECAUSE HE HAS THREE YEARS. 3 THE COURT: BUT YOU JUST HAVE ONE DEPARTMENT OF 4 JUSTICE, SO THERE NEEDS TO BE COORDINATION AND 5 CONSISTENCY, DON'T YOU THINK, IN HOW THAT'S HANDLED? MR. RENFER: I WOULD ASSUME THAT IT WOULD DEPEND 6 7 UPON EACH UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE AND WHEN THEY WOULD LOOK AT -- THE CRIMINAL DIVISION IN THAT OFFICE 9 WOULD LOOK AT THE INDIVIDUAL CASES AND MAKE A 10 DETERMINATION. WE'VE NOT FACED THIS QUESTION PREVIOUSLY, 11 SO I'M JUST --12 THE COURT: BUT THAT DOESN'T SOUND RIGHT. YOU 13 COULDN'T HAVE TEN DIFFERENT DISTRICTS AND HAVE TEN 14 DETAINEES, ALL OF WHOM HAVE THEIR SUPERVISED RELEASE 15 RUNNING, HAVE IT RUN OUT WHILE THEY'RE IN DETENTION AND 16 THEN FIVE OF THEM, YOU KNOW, THE DISTRICT COURT AND THE 17 U.S. ATTORNEY AGREE IT'S EXPIRED AND THEN IN FIVE THEY DON'T AGREE. THAT DOESN'T SEEM LIKE THAT'S GOING TO WORK 18 19 OUT. 20 MR. RENFER: I UNDERSTAND, YOUR HONOR. 21 THE COURT: OKAY. 22 MS. LITTLE: YOUR HONOR, MY CLIENT'S INDICATED 23 TO US THAT HE WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS THE COURT. 24 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. ALDRICH: WHAT YOU WERE JUST TALKING ABOUT,

1	THERE'S TWO PEOPLE THAT HAVE FILED MOTIONS IN A COURT.
2	THEY GOT ORDERS BACK FROM THEIR JUDGES SAYING THAT THEIR
3	TIME IS RUNNING, BECAUSE WE'RE UNDER CIVIL, NOT CRIMINAL.
4	THOSE WERE ORDERS FROM THE COURT.
5	AND THEN OTHER PEOPLE, SOME HAVE WRITTEN TO PROBATION
6	OFFICERS AND THE PROBATION, UNDER 3624(E), OKAY, LIKE I
7	SAID, WE'RE UNDER CIVIL, NOT CRIMINAL, SO OUR PROBATION
8	SHOULD BE RUNNING. AND THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT ALL SAID
9	THE SAME THING.
10	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.
11	ALL RIGHT. I'LL FOLLOW UP ON YOUR HABEAS PETITION.
12	DO YOU HAVE A MOTION TO DISMISS HERE ALSO?
13	MS. LITTLE: YES, YOUR HONOR, WE DO. WE WILL BE
14	FILING A SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION LIKE WE HAVE IN THE OTHER
15	CASES.
16	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	END OF TRANSCRIPT
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS TAKEN AT THE CRIMINAL SESSION OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE TRANSCRIPTION OF THE PROCEEDINGS TAKEN BY ME IN MACHINE SHORTHAND AND TRANSCRIBED BY COMPUTER UNDER MY SUPERVISION. THIS THE 6TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2011. /S/ DONNA J. TOMAWSKI DONNA J. TOMAWSKI OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER